Message

From: Dave Kleidermacher ggoogle.com]

Sent: 8/15/2018 4:02:29 AM

To: William Luh @google.com]

Subject: Re: Fortnite today

There's a bit of debate remaining on this 15 v 90 issue

VP, Head of Security - Android, Chrome OS, Play

My position is: public disclosure of the flaw (e.g. blog details, buganizer) is 90 days, per industry standards. I think we're all aligned on this.

However, GPP may flag privilege escalation for the app sooner (7 days grace period for top partner even though not on Play, we used 15 days here in an abundance of caution, usually GPP provides off-market apps 0 days grace), in order to protect users against potential harm (users can decide not to use install the app) in case the developer takes longer to fix. This is not a disclosure since we're providing zero public details about what is wrong with the app.

The main debate is whether security vulnerabilities that enable an unexpected illicit access/permission (loading any app with the right package name...) like this would be classified as PHA/privesc or not (and warrant GPP action on device). I've seen a bunch of similar cases (Xiaomi, Adups, debug SDKs left in images, etc.) recently. We don't know there's malicious intent and in fact I don't think we should ever consider intent. The bottom line is the app is potentially harmful to users, regardless of intent. Do you have an opinion on this? Would like to make sure GPP leads are aligned. If this app is not a privesc based on our PHA philosophy, we need to have a clear, objective reason why it's not. Otherwise we may end up being forced to give every app vuln situation a 90 day grace period, leaving users at much higher risk than we have today.

Thanks,

On Tue, Aug 14, 2018 at 8:53 PM William Luh Hi Dave,
I wasn't in the Fortnite meetings today, but Lydia did a fantastic job summarizing everything in <u>go/fortnite-tf</u> . It looks like it's been decided to give 90 days instead of 15
Thanks, William
BR,
Dave
Dave Kleidermacher

